

Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council
Meeting Minutes
July 24, 2009
Port Angeles, WA

Introduction

Terrie Klinger called the meeting to order. Members and guests introduced themselves. Kevin Duffy from NOAA's Northwest Science Center said that he would be replacing Steve Capps as the NOAA Fisheries representative. He gave a brief summary of his background. The agenda was adopted without changes. The minutes of the May meeting were adopted unanimously with no changes.

Management Plan Review Flowchart update

George Galasso, OCNMS Assistant Superintendent, explained that we are on track with the milestones that appear in the flowchart. He reviewed the number of steps and milestones that have already been accomplished. He stated that the most recent document, based upon recommendations by the advisory council for grouping priority topics, will be turned into a priority issue work plan that will be posted on the web site. The remainder of this year is organizing and beginning the work of various work groups and workshops that will develop the actions and strategies that will constitute the action plans in the revised management plan. In the next fiscal year, we will be finishing the work of the work groups and begin the drafting of the revised management plan. The target is to present the revised draft management plan and any regulatory changes at the September 2010 advisory council meeting.

In response to a question about the sanctuary program budget, Carol reported that the U.S. House of Representative had passed their version of the NOAA budget with about \$4 million above the administration request. At this point, it is in the Senate appropriations subcommittee. For planning purposes now, the sanctuary program is developing next year's budget with a 5% decrease over the current year. Once the final numbers from Congress are known, then adjustments to this budget will be made.

IPC annual meeting report and IPC involvement in management plan review

Rob Jones of the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission referred to several IPC documents that went out with the meeting packet, including the IPC Annual Report. After the annual meeting, the IPC discussed participation in work groups and workshops. In general the IPC is interested in all the issues that are being considered and want to participate in all of them. At the same time, as according to the MPR flowchart, the IPC as an organization will review the work of all the groups and workshops collectively at the appropriate time. Rob reviewed each of the topic areas and described the anticipated IPC involvement. IPC members have already participated in the Goals and Objectives work group. There is a high degree of interest among the tribes in the Collaborative Research, Assessment, and Monitoring work group and each tribe has already designated representatives in that group. The tribes are also in discussions about

representation in the rest of the groups and the two workshops and expect to participate fully in each group and workshop.

In a separate item, George Galasso gave an update on the ONMS three-year strategic report that is in draft form. He has checked with headquarters and has gotten the go ahead to give it too those advisory council members who wish to see it. It should be finalized fairly soon. Terrie urged that those who want to see it contact George and he will provide you with the link.

Goals and Objectives Work Group Report

Chip Boothe, chair of the Goals and Objectives work group, introduced the draft that the work group prepared on goals and objectives. He explained the process that the work group used. Staff drafted an initial document for the work group to consider as a starting point. The work group also used a number of relevant documents, including: the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries National Strategic Plan, the existing OCNMS management plan, the IPC workshop report and priority topics, the advisory council priority management needs, the IPC guidance document on the OCNMS work plan.

The order of the first two draft goals and objectives reflects the priority ranking that the IPC developed for MPR topics and the work plan and adopted at the May advisory council meeting. The remainder of the draft goals and objectives reflect the priority topic areas identified by the advisory council at the January workshop. These draft goals and objectives will help guide the sanctuary over the next five to ten years and will assist the individual MPR work groups and workshops as they develop recommendations and action plans for the revised management plan. **Chip Boothe moved to adopt the goals and objective as contained in the work group draft. Bob Bohlman seconded the motion.** Discussion followed.

A member suggested that the concept of “stewardship” did not really belong under Goal B, “Promote collaborative and coordinated management and stewardship of resources in the Sanctuary”. Fan Tsao responded that during the process of developing this draft it was clear there were countless ways to do the wording of the items. Fan stated that the stewardship clause could be eliminated from this item, but that one thing they learned in developing this draft is that there are countless ways items could be grouped under the various goals and objective. Chip Boothe stated that it would be better not to get into the minutiae of wordsmithing each of the goals and objectives, but to focus on the broader intent and make sure everything we want is contained somewhere in this document. He noted that the national goal from which they adapted this goal reads as follows: “Build and strengthen the nation-wide system of marine sanctuaries, maintain and enhance the role of the ONMS’s system in larger marine protected area networks, and help provide both national and international leadership for marine protected area management and marine resource stewardship.”

In response to a question about whether any of the proposed goals and objectives would cause difficulties for the sanctuary, Carol Bernthal responded that she did not see in major problems. It is a reasonable and ambitious set of goals and objectives with a large

vision. It is the function of the action plans to take these general ideas and develop specific strategies for them in the revised management plan. Carol also urged keeping the stewardship concept in place, because it has a broad meaning. It also means how we engage our citizens and their communities in the protection of the resources. She thinks that is captured under Goal B, Objective 1. Carol also suggested that after the work groups meet, there will be an opportunity to revisit the goals and objectives to see if they need to be altered or augmented.

A member suggested that there needed to be some statement not just about sharing research data, but enhancing the opportunity for collaborative research. Terrie Klinger responded that she thought that the proposed language “investigate and enhance the understanding of ecosystem processes” is a fairly broad notion that would encourage a range of research.

A discussion followed among members and staff about promoting and coordinating research and the nature of research in the sanctuary, as well as the role and limitations of actions that the sanctuary can take within the topic of research. The OCNMS has very limited research funds of its own, and as a matter of course collaborates with other researchers on work within the sanctuary. The sense of the council was that it was needed to be more explicitly stated. **Therefore, It was agreed to add an additional objective under C that reads “Promote scientific research in collaboration with others.”**

Another member noted that there was really a difference between looking at climate change and oceanic conditions which may or may not be directly tied to climate change. **It was also agreed to change the language in Objective 1 under Goal C to read: “To understand the effects of changing climate and ocean conditions on the sanctuary’s ecosystem.” (47:45).**

Public Comment

Ben Enticknap, Oceana’s Project Manager, stated that Oceana is very interested in the OCNMS management plan process and provided scoping comments early on during the scoping process. Oceana wanted to highlight certain goals and objectives that they think are important to consider as the process moves forward toward developing a revised management plan. The current management plan makes the highest priority management goal of the sanctuary the protection of the marine environment, resources, and qualities of the sanctuary. He urged that this should remain the highest priority management goal in the new plan. Oceana believes that in order to have resilient marine ecosystems, marine species and the food web need to be protected. The protection of krill off the west coast is an example where the sanctuaries led the way to institute this ban and preserve an important component of the west coast food web. He urged the sanctuary to consider adding a point under topic C, habitat mapping, to identify the threats and stressors to the important habitats. Oceana also has a long-standing interest in protecting deep sea coral habitat within the sanctuary and wants to see that continue in partnership with the tribes

and the Pacific Fisheries Management Council. In general the goals and objectives are on the right track, with some additional points as Oceana has suggested.

Carol Bernthal asked if the language in Objective 1 under Goal E addressed some of their concerns about stressors. Ben responded that focuses on protection by mitigating or reducing stressors, but there still needs to be an initial step of indentifying the stressors.

Chip Boothe commented that they were not tasked to address the mission of the sanctuary, but that the current mission language addresses the issues that Ben raised as the higher goal of the sanctuary. He viewed the goals and objectives at the building blocks on which to achieve the mission of the sanctuary.

Teresa Scott pointed out that their workgroup was also looking at inventorying stressors on sanctuary resources. Fan Tsao pointed out several places where the language, without being specific, would support such inventorying and that it is implicit in several areas of the document.

Andy Palmer suggested that the summary of the discussion of the document from the minutes could help clarify the intent and content of the goals and objectives and could be used as a guide for the work groups and workshops.

Fred Felleman of Wave Consulting, representing both the Makah Tribe and Friends of the Earth, commented that both organizations support the insertion of the concept of prevention into the oil spills goals. He also urged the expansion of Objective 3 under Goal D, Ocean Literacy, to better utilize the web so that notification of the meetings should occur right on the home page, rather than having to dig through several layers to find out what the agenda is. He noted that the document doesn't mention goals and objectives that are contained in species recovery plans like the plans for Puget Sound orcas. The sanctuary plays an important role in sustaining this population, especially during the winter months.

One member asked Fred Felleman to clarify some references he made to the international border. He responded that there is a lot of cooperation that goes on between Washington and British Columbia such as the vessel traffic system, the halibut commission, the salmon commission that underscores the importance of cross-border arrangements to manage marine resources. He suggested that there isn't really any reference to this in the Goals and Objectives.

Advisory council members agreed that it was good idea to include “prevention” under E, Objective 2 so that it reads: Actively participate in regional spill prevention, contingency planning, emergency response, damage assessment, and restoration activities”.

Terrie Klinger called for the adoption of the Goals and Objectives with the few specified changes annunciated previously. The advisory council members passed the motion unanimously, with no abstentions.

Ecosystem-based management presentation

Terrie Klinger introduced Professor Dave Fluharty of the School of Marine Affairs at the University of Washington. He also chairs NOAA's Science Advisory Board, served on the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council, and is a recognized expert in ecosystem-based management. Terrie explained that since concepts of ecosystem-based management run through many of the priority topics that the work groups will be tackling, it was felt that the whole group could benefit from hearing this presentation.

Professor Fluharty began the presentation by showing a blank slide and asked that everyone think about what they think ecosystem-based management (EBM) is. Even if we are not aware of it, everyone deals with EBM every day. We know more about ecosystems than we think we do. We need to make that knowledge more relevant to managing and restoring ecosystems than we have done to date. The NOAA definition of an ecosystem is "An ecosystem is a geographically specified system of organisms, including humans, the environment, and processes that control the dynamics." Characteristics of the EBM approach is that it is adaptive and incremental, one step at a time, takes account of ecosystem knowledge, considers multiple external influences, strikes a balance of diverse social objectives and is geographically specified. He recommended a recent book by Heather Leslie (*Ecosystem-based Management for the Oceans*, Island Press) as good primer and useful reference for the latest thinking on EBM.

Professor Fluharty stated that he thought OCNMS had a particularly good opportunity to apply EBM tools, because it is less impacted by extensive human activities as opposed to other places such as Puget Sound, where the human impact is very large. He prefers to think of EBM as a process, rather than an end point. There is work being done to develop tools to assist EBM. One of the tools is ecological forecasting – modeling where the ecosystem is heading over time. Another tool is integrated ecosystem assessment. This provides a dynamic assessment of what we know is going on in an ecosystem. In addition, there are a number of other initiatives underway that are going to drive EBM within NOAA, including the two Ocean Policy reports that came out a few years ago, and the new administration's initiative aimed at coordinated ocean management and marine spatial planning. Equally important is to remember that we don't need to know everything before starting EBM. The expertise among the advisory council members is certainly adequate to launch an EBM approach in the sanctuary.

In response to a question about getting timely or real time data inputs to assist in doing EBM, Professor Fluharty stated that there are some early efforts to collect and disseminate data using ships of opportunity and other sources, but that it will still be a number of years before a wide variety of data would be available to managers as quickly as we would like.

Working Group status reports

George Galasso reported on the Collaborative and Coordinated Management topic. He reminded members that at this point the advisory council has not decided to create a work group for this topic. He reported that he has been talking to the Coast Guard about the

memorandum of agreement (MOA) that exists between the sanctuary and the Coast Guard. Using this MOA model, he has also been talking to representatives with NOAA Fisheries. In addition, he expects to schedule similar meeting with the Olympic National Park, the Wildlife Refuge, the Navy and the potential for doing something with the State of Washington as well as the individual coastal treaty tribes.

Terrie Klinger described the progress of the Collaborative Research, Assessment and Monitoring work group. Joe Schumacker, with assistance from Rob Johnson and Eric Wilkins, will serve as co-chair with Terrie. Staff will be Ed Bowlby. AC members are Diane Butorac, Joe Gilbertson, Fan Tsao, Jody Kennedy, Joel Kawahara, Jennifer Hagen, Steve Joner, and Bob Boekelheide. They have held an initial conference call. The next steps are to finalize the membership, determine the structure of the group, define the scope of EBM principles to be used, and identify the data needs. The goal is to have an initial report to the AC by the November meeting, if possible and a final report to the AC by January, 2010. Fred Felleman suggested they might invite the president of the Friday Harbor Whale Museum Board of Directors to participate.

Fan Tsao reported that the Living Resource Conservation work group has currently more than twenty members. Because of a rather broad scope, the group will focus on five issue areas. The first is marine debris, which will be a stand-alone topic based upon all the comments received during the scoping process. Other human activities and impacts are grouped under water quality, wildlife disturbance, habitat disturbance, and community structure changes. An initial meeting will be held in the later part of August, with bi-weekly phone calls over a 6 week period with the aim of wrapping up the work in November.

Bob Bohlman reported that the Spill Prevention and Preparedness Response and Restoration work group is co-chaired by Chip Boothe, and staffed by Liam Antrim and Bob Pavia. They are reviewing what the current legislation and regulations require and also what activities have been done in the past. There are around twenty members at this point. They plan on holding an all-day face-to-face meeting. Subsequently they will hold meetings by conference call. They are hoping to have something for the November AC meeting.

Meri Parker, chair for the Ocean Literacy workshop, has worked with OCNMS education coordinator Bob Steelquist to review the scoping comments relating to this topic and are planning all day workshops on this topic as well as Maritime Heritage in the Fall.

Brady Scott, co-chair with Teresa Scott, reported that the Socioeconomic work group is going to be assisted by Matt Brookhardt from NOAA West Coast Regional Office, as well as OCNMS' Lauren Bennett. They have held three conference calls so far. They have put together a timeline with a workshop scheduled for October. Following the workshop they will produce a workshop document that will be reviewed by the workshop participants, with the hope that they can report on this by the November meeting. They have drafted an agenda. They are going to first look at what perspectives they would like

to have at the workshop before inviting specific individuals. They will continue to meet on a weekly basis until the workshop is held.

Superintendent's Report

Carol Bernthal gave some feedback on the West Coast ocean acidification research recommendation that the advisory council had passed. She reported that Bill Douros, West Coast Regional Superintendent, is looking at this comprehensively to develop a strategy for all the west coast sanctuaries. It is a complex and potentially expensive effort and not an easy question to answer. He is asking for the west coast advisory council chairs to participate in a conference call to go over what has been going on to date with ocean acidification and get input from each of the chairs about what types of activities might take place. There is a lot of activity at OCNMS on ocean acidification. She asked Mary Sue Brancato to put together a list of current and proposed research on ocean acidification. The sanctuary has already started to collect data on water quality in conjunction with the Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory. There are also some research proposals in the works to look at impacts on deep sea corals. OCNMS staff has also been participating with a group looking at a comprehensive research strategy for the entire west coast. We have been monitoring for hypoxia again this summer, but at this date haven't seen any major events of low oxygen condition.

Carol reported that they have been ongoing discussions with the Navy on its two DEIS's on Navy training activities in the sanctuary. There are some points of differences on interpretation of what is required of the Navy in terms of the expansion of the Quinault Underwater Training Range that will require additional consultations. George Hart said that the target for getting the final EIS out for both proposals is early next year, possibly January.

Andy Palmer pointed out that the Navy has applied to NOAA for a take of marine mammals in connection with both proposals, but that they wouldn't be acted upon until the issuance of the FEIS.

Fred Felleman would like to see NOAA grant additional time to comment on the taking applications. He also noted that appears that the Navy has, in the Northwest Training Complex DEIS, agreed not to conduct any activities within Puget Sound and the inland waters, including sonar activities, that could potentially harm marine mammals. He wanted to thank the Navy for coming to this decision.

Internal Affairs

Terrie asked that AC members to consider whether to change the meeting day from the third Friday to the fourth Friday in the meeting month to allow better participation by the Northwest Straits Commission. Carolyn Gibson reported that the Commission had scheduled its meetings next year on the fourth Friday of the month, so it was unnecessary to change the current schedule for AC meetings. There was some discussion about whether Friday was the best time or not. It was decided to leave it on Friday.

Terrie Klinger announced that OCNMS will host the SAC Summit in May 2010. She noted that in other meetings, the AC members have turned out for a reception that the Summit holds. It is a good opportunity to meet with chairs and coordinators from other sanctuaries. SAC members are also invited to attend the sessions. Fred Felleman asked whether the summit had opportunities for public comment. Neither Terrie and Andy could recall if other meetings had public comment. Carol will get back to Fred.

Public Comment

No public comment

Future agenda items

Work group reports

Update on current research projects

Update on the education programs

Other carryover items from previous agendas

Staff presentation on Sanctuary Operations related to MPR